

In traversing the restriction requirement, applicants note initially that an undue search burden would not seem to be placed on the Examiner in conducting a search for relevant prior art for the three invention classes indicated because a complete search for relevant prior art is indicated as possible in a single Class which is Class 430 and in three subclasses. This is in accordance with Section 803 of the MPEP which states that if a search and examination of an entire application without serious serious burden should be conducted even if the claims of the application include claims to independent or distinct inventions.

As to the designation of the claims of Group II as separate and distinct from Claims 10 and 11, wherein it should be noted that Claims 10 and 11 have been canceled in favor of claims of proper statutory method of making format, restriction can be required only if it can be shown that the product, in this case a barrier rib for an EL display element, can be made by a method which is materially different from the method claimed in the application. No such method, as an alternative to that which is presently claimed, has been shown or demonstrated on the record. Further, restriction is only proper where it can be shown that the claimed method or process can be employed to prepare a materially product than that which is claimed. Again, no demonstration has been provided on the record to show that such can be done. Accordingly, restriction between the claims of Groups II and III is not believed to be proper and rejoinder of the claims of Group III with those of Group II is respectfully requested.

As to the matter of the claims of Groups I and II being viewed in an intermediate/final product relationship, a restriction is only possible as described in Section 806.04(b) of the MPEP if it can be demonstrated that the intermediate, in this case the radiation sensitive resin composition, can be used to make something other than the claimed final product, in this case the claimed barrier rib. There has been no demonstration on the record that, in fact, the claimed radiation sensitive resin composition of the can be used to prepare something other than the

claimed product. Absent such a demonstration, the restriction requirement can not be sustained. Further, given that there has been no demonstration of distinction between the intermediate and the final product, it is also believed clear that the Examiner has shown separate and distinct inventions between the intermediate and the process by which the intermediate is used to prepare a final product. Accordingly, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

It is now believed that the application is in proper condition for further consideration on its merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618



22850

TEL: 703-413-3000
FAX: 703-413-2220

Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 27,013

DOCKET NUMBER: 206525US0
SERIAL NUMBER: 09/840,130

**MARKED-UP COPY OF AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO
RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend Claims 4 and 5 as follows:

--4. (Amended) A barrier rib for an EL display element which is formed from [the] a radiation sensitive resin composition [of claim 1] comprising (A) an alkali soluble resin, (B) a polymerizable compound having an ethylenically unsaturated bond, and (C) a radiation sensitive polymerization initiator.

5. (Amended) [A] The barrier rib for an EL display element [which is formed from the radiation sensitive resin composition of claim 1] according to Claim 4, wherein the resin composition contains a colorant.--

Please cancel Claims 10 and 11 in favor of new Claims 12 and 13 as follows:

Claims 12 and 13. (Newly Added)